



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,983	02/28/2001	Tom Gilchrist	MUR-8564US	3635
7590	01/06/2005		EXAMINER	
Allan Ratner Ratner & Prestia Suite 301 One Westlakes Berwyn PO Box 980 Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980			YU, GINA C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/763,983	Applicant(s) GILCHRIST ET AL.	
	Examiner Gina C. Yu	Art Unit 1617	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See continuation sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,7,8,11 and 22-28.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____


SREENI PADMANABHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of No. 5:

Applicants' remarks based on the amendment have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Examiner takes the position that the final rejection of the record should be maintained since Bakis (US 5861461), the prior art of the record, teaches the motivation to practice the claimed process which is recited in the proposed amendment.

Applicants argue that the selection of a second precipitant which comprises a polyvalent metal ion would not have been obvious to a skilled artisan. Applicants assert that the Bakis treatment of a cross-linked foam in Example 1 with sodium citrate caused foam gelation, wherein the present invention method results in further stabilization of the foam. Examiner notes that the reference teaches in col. 4, lines 25 –65 the different effects of mono- and di-or trivalent metal cations on crosslinking the polysaccharide form. The reference specifically teaches in lines 34-40, that treating with an insoluble carbonate or hydrogen carbonate salt having one or more di- or tri-valent cations is dispersed in the foam ed polysaccharide, and "the foam may be subsequently treated with a strong acid to liberate carbon dioxide as gas and said cations which then cross-link with the polysaccharide to form a dimensionally stable foam structure." Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have known to crosslink the polysaccharide foam with di- or trivalent metal cations to make a dimensionally stable foam structure. The reference in lines 49 – 65 also teaches the effect of further treating the crosslinked foam with mono-valent cations would impart a degree of solubility in the foam. Thus, the idea of controlling the solubility of the foam by further treating with mono-, di-or trivalent

Art Unit: 1617

cations that affect the solubility and stability of the foam would have been obvious to the routineer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gina C. Yu whose telephone number is 571-272-0635.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gina Yu
Patent Examiner